

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
EASTERN DISTRICT OF WISCONSIN**

JULIAN R. BLACKSHEAR,

Plaintiff,

v.

Case No. 18-CV-1451-JPS

DR. SPOTTS, DR. CHEN, DR.
CASTILLIO, DR. TOKAR, DR.
WILINSKI, DR. HAGAN, DR.
KOZMIN, DR. BUHLS, and DR.
KREMBS,

Defendants.

ORDER

Plaintiff Julian R. Blackshear, a prisoner proceeding in this matter *pro se*, filed a complaint alleging that Defendants violated his constitutional rights. (Docket #1). This matter comes before the court on Plaintiff's petition to proceed without prepayment of the filing fee (*in forma pauperis*). (Docket #2). Plaintiff has been assessed and has paid an initial partial filing fee of \$1.21. 28 U.S.C. § 1915(b).

The court shall screen complaints brought by prisoners seeking relief against a governmental entity or an officer or employee of a governmental entity. 28 U.S.C. § 1915A(a). The court must dismiss a complaint or portion thereof if the prisoner has raised claims that are legally "frivolous or malicious," that fail to state a claim upon which relief may be granted, or that seek monetary relief from a defendant who is immune from such relief. *Id.* § 1915A(b).

A claim is legally frivolous when it lacks an arguable basis either in law or in fact. *Denton v. Hernandez*, 504 U.S. 25, 31 (1992); *Neitzke v. Williams*, 490 U.S. 319, 325 (1989); *Hutchinson ex rel. Baker v. Spink*, 126 F.3d 895, 900

(7th Cir. 1997). The court may, therefore, dismiss a claim as frivolous where it is based on an indisputably meritless legal theory or where the factual contentions are clearly baseless. *Neitzke*, 490 U.S. at 327. “Malicious,” although sometimes treated as a synonym for “frivolous,” “is more usefully construed as intended to harass.” *Lindell v. McCallum*, 352 F.3d 1107, 1109–10 (7th Cir. 2003) (citations omitted).

To state a cognizable claim under the federal notice pleading system, the plaintiff is required to provide a “short and plain statement of the claim showing that [he] is entitled to relief[.]” Fed. R. Civ. P. 8(a)(2). It is not necessary for the plaintiff to plead specific facts and his statement need only “give the defendant fair notice of what the . . . claim is and the grounds upon which it rests.” *Bell Atl. Corp. v. Twombly*, 550 U.S. 544, 555 (2007) (quoting *Conley v. Gibson*, 355 U.S. 41, 47 (1957)). However, a complaint that offers mere “labels and conclusions” or a “formulaic recitation of the elements of a cause of action will not do.” *Ashcroft v. Iqbal*, 556 U.S. 662, 678 (2009) (quoting *Twombly*, 550 U.S. at 555).

To state a claim, a complaint must contain sufficient factual matter, accepted as true, “that is plausible on its face.” *Id.* (quoting *Twombly*, 550 U.S. at 570). “A claim has facial plausibility when the plaintiff pleads factual content that allows the court to draw the reasonable inference that the defendant is liable for the misconduct alleged.” *Id.* (citing *Twombly*, 550 U.S. at 556). The complaint’s allegations “must be enough to raise a right to relief above the speculative level.” *Twombly*, 550 U.S. at 555 (citation omitted).

In considering whether a complaint states a claim, courts should follow the principles set forth in *Twombly* by first, “identifying pleadings that, because they are no more than conclusions, are not entitled to the

assumption of truth.” *Iqbal*, 556 U.S. at 679. Legal conclusions must be supported by factual allegations. *Id.* If there are well-pleaded factual allegations, the court must, second, “assume their veracity and then determine whether they plausibly give rise to an entitlement to relief.” *Id.*

To state a claim for relief under 42 U.S.C. Section 1983, a plaintiff must allege that: 1) he was deprived of a right secured by the Constitution or laws of the United States; and 2) the deprivation was visited upon him by a person or persons acting under color of state law. *Buchanan-Moore v. Cty. of Milwaukee*, 570 F.3d 824, 827 (7th Cir. 2009) (citing *Kramer v. Vill. of N. Fond du Lac*, 384 F.3d 856, 861 (7th Cir. 2004)); see also *Gomez v. Toledo*, 446 U.S. 635, 640 (1980). The court is obliged to give the plaintiff’s *pro se* allegations, “however inartfully pleaded,” a liberal construction. See *Erickson v. Pardus*, 551 U.S. 89, 94 (2007) (quoting *Estelle v. Gamble*, 429 U.S. 97, 106 (1976)).

During the events of this case, Plaintiff was incarcerated at Racine Correctional Institution (“RCI”), and Defendants were medical staff at the prison. Plaintiff alleges that for two years at the prison, he was given little or no psychological treatment for his demonstrated suicidal and self-harming tendencies. Plaintiff suggests that Defendants, psychologists and medical doctors, simply did not believe his symptoms were genuine. Plaintiff further alleges that he was eventually placed on a battery of medications which increased, rather than decreased, his suicidal ideations. Plaintiff notes that he engaged in various acts of self-harm during this time, which could have been prevented if he had been prescribed proper medications and been appropriately seen by mental health treatment providers.

Plaintiff's allegations implicate his rights under the Eighth Amendment right to adequate medical care. Prison officials violate this right when they "display deliberate indifference to serious medical needs of prisoners." *Greeno v. Daley*, 414 F.3d 645, 652 (7th Cir. 2005) (quotation omitted). Deliberate indifference claims contain both an objective and a subjective component: the inmate "must first establish that his medical condition is objectively, 'sufficiently serious,'; and second, that prison officials acted with a 'sufficiently culpable state of mind,' – i.e., that they both knew of and disregarded an excessive risk to inmate health." *Lewis v. McLean*, 864 F.3d 556, 562–63 (7th Cir. 2017) (quoting *Farmer v. Brennan*, 511 U.S. 825, 834 (1994) (internal citations omitted)). Acts, and genuine threats, of self-harm can constitute a serious medical need. *Pittman ex rel. Hamilton v. Cty. of Madison, Ill.*, 746 F.3d 766, 775–76 (7th Cir. 2014).

However, the overarching problem with Plaintiff's complaint is that it appears his allegations about threats and acts of self-harm are largely duplicative of allegations he made in another case in this District, *Blackshear v. Amin et al.*, Case No. 18-CV-853-JPS (E.D. Wis.). In that case, Blackshear alleged that, during 2017, he was placed in clinical observation status due to threats of suicide, and the defendants, all RCI employees, either were deliberately indifferent to the hazards in his observation cell or failed to provide him proper medical attention while he was in observation status, all in violation of his rights under the Eighth Amendment. On March 13, 2020, the Court granted the defendants' motion for summary judgment in that case and dismissed the case with prejudice. Case No. 18-CV-853-JPS, (Docket #97 and #98).

While there is not direct overlap between this case and his previous case in terms of the defendants he names, there is substantial overlap. Any

claim that was alleged and dismissed in Plaintiff's previous case cannot proceed here. The Court will not do Plaintiff's work for him to identify which, if any, claims in this case are different from claims that have already been decided. Therefore, the Court will dismiss Plaintiff's complaint without prejudice. He may file an amended complaint if he believes he can allege viable claims against the defendants named herein.

Accordingly,

IT IS ORDERED that Plaintiff's motion for leave to proceed without prepayment of the filing fee (*in forma pauperis*) (Docket #2) be and the same is hereby **GRANTED**;

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that Plaintiff's complaint (Docket #1) be and the same is hereby **DISMISSED without prejudice**;

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that Plaintiff's may file an amended complaint **within fourteen (14) days** of the entry of this Order, or the case will be dismissed without further notice;

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that the agency having custody of Plaintiff shall collect from his institution trust account the balance of the filing fee, \$348.79, by collecting monthly payments from Plaintiff's prison trust account in an amount equal to 20% of the preceding month's income credited to Plaintiff's trust account and forwarding payments to the Clerk of Court each time the amount in the account exceeds \$10 in accordance with 28 U.S.C. § 1915(b)(2). The payments shall be clearly identified by the case name and number assigned to this action. If Plaintiff is transferred to another institution, county, state, or federal, the transferring institution shall forward a copy of this Order along with Plaintiff's remaining balance to the receiving institution;

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that a copy of this order be sent to the officer in charge of the agency where Plaintiff is confined; and

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that, pursuant to the Prisoner E-Filing Program, Plaintiff shall submit all correspondence and case filings to institution staff, who will scan and e-mail documents to the Court. If Plaintiff is no longer incarcerated at a Prisoner E-Filing institution, he will be required to submit all correspondence and legal material to:


Office of the Clerk
United States District Court
Eastern District of Wisconsin
362 United States Courthouse
517 E. Wisconsin Avenue
Milwaukee, Wisconsin 53202

PLEASE DO NOT MAIL ANYTHING DIRECTLY TO THE COURT'S CHAMBERS. It will only delay the processing of the matter.

Plaintiff is further advised that failure to make a timely submission may result in the dismissal of this action for failure to prosecute. In addition, the parties must notify the Clerk of Court of any change of address. Failure to do so could result in orders or other information not being timely delivered, thus affecting the legal rights of the parties.

Dated at Milwaukee, Wisconsin, this 2nd day of April, 2020.

BY THE COURT:



J. P. Stadtmueller
U.S. District Judge